FILE COPY

SUPREME COURT, U.S.
FILED
SEP 21 1960
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1960

No. 322

RICHARD HARRIS,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES,

Respondent.

IN RE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

REPLY BRIEF

Richard Harris,
Pro se,
Calhoun Road,
Greenbelt Valley, Pa.

INDEX

	Page
Opinion Below	1
Argument	2

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1960

No. 322

RICHARD HARRIS,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES,

Respondent

IN RE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

REPLY BRIEF

Opinion Below

It is necessary to file this reply brief to clarify certain issues.

1. Defendant's attorneys state that no opinion was filed, whereas in fact the opinion is merged in the order of dismissal; and stated that such dismissal was by reason of lack of jurisdiction because of the provisions of U. S. Code 2501; but said opinion so merged failed to recognize the fact that all delays were caused by the inducements and

promises made by plaintiff's superiors whose directions he followed as of course; likewise the opinion so merged failed to state a definite date at which the Court deemed the statute tolled.

Argument

2. None of the allegations have been denied or controverted by the defendant; therefor all allegations of the plaintiff must be accepted as true. Plaintiff was and is prepared to support them by convincing proof thereof.

Plaintiff is entitled to his day in court which has been denied him.

In the cause of justice, plaintiff is entitled to be heard and respectfully submits that a writ of Certiorari should issue.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD HARRIS,
Pro se,
Cathcart Road,
Gwynedd Valley, Pa.